arXiv:1610.08277v1 [math.DS] 26 Oct 2016

A boundary value problem of a generalised linear discrete time system with no solutions and infinitely many solutions

Nicholas Apostolopoulos[1], Fernando Ortega[2] and Grigoris Kalogeropoulos[3]

[1]National Technical University of Athens, Greece
[2] Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain
[3]National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

Abstract: In this article we study a class of generalised linear systems of difference equations with given boundary conditions and assume that the boundary value problem is non-consistent, i.e. it has infinite many or no solutions. We take into consideration the case that the coefficients are square constant matrices with the leading coefficient singular and provide optimal solutions. Numerical examples are given to justify our theory.

Keywords: generalised, system, difference equations, linear, discrete time system.

1 Introduction

Many authors have studied generalised discrete & continuous time systems, see [1-28], and their applications, see [29-36]. Many of these results have already been extended to systems of differential & difference equations with fractional operators, see [37-45]. We consider the generalised discrete time system of the form

$$FY_{k+1} = GY_k, \quad k = 1, 2, ..., N-1 \tag{1}$$

with known boundary conditions

$$A_1 Y_0 = B_1, \quad A_2 Y_N = B_2. \tag{2}$$

Where $F, G \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times m}$, $Y_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $A_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{r_1\times m}$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{r_2\times m}$, $B_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{r_1\times 1}$ and $B_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{r_2\times 1}$. The matrices F, G can be non-square ($r \neq m$) or square ($r = m$) with F singular ($\det F$=0).

Generalised linear systems of difference equations with given boundary conditions don't always guarantee to have unique solution. In the case where there exist solutions and they are infinite, we require optimal solutions for the system. The aim of this paper is to generalise existing results regarding the literature. An explicit and easily testable formula is derived of an optimal solution for the system.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we will use in several parts matrix pencil theory to establish our results. A matrix pencil is a family of matrices $sF-G$, parametrized by a complex number

s, see [46-53].

Definition 2.1. Given $F, G \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times m}$ and an arbitrary $s \in \mathbb{C}$, the matrix pencil $sF - G$ is called:

1. Regular when $r = m$ and $\det(sF - G) \neq 0$;
2. Singular when $r \neq m$ or $r = m$ and $\det(sF - G) \equiv 0$.

In this article we consider the system (1) with a *regular pencil*, where the class of $sF - G$ is characterized by a uniquely defined element, known as the Weierstrass canonical form, see [46-53], specified by the complete set of invariants of $sF - G$. This is the set of elementary divisors of type $(s - a_j)^{p_j}$, called *finite elementary divisors*, where a_j is a finite eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity p_j $(1 \leq j \leq \nu)$, and the set of elementary divisors of type $\hat{s}^q = \frac{1}{s^q}$, called *infinite elementary divisors*, where q is the algebraic multiplicity of the infinite eigenvalue. $\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} p_j = p$ and $p + q = m$.

From the regularity of $sF - G$, there exist non-singular matrices P, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} PFQ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0_{p,q} \\ 0_{q,p} & H_q \end{bmatrix}, \\ PGQ &= \begin{bmatrix} J_p & 0_{p,q} \\ 0_{q,p} & I_q \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

J_p, H_q are appropriate matrices with H_q a nilpotent matrix with index q_*, J_p a Jordan matrix and $p + q = m$. With $0_{q,p}$ we denote the zero matrix of $q \times p$. The matrix Q can be written as

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} Q_p & Q_q \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

$Q_p \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times p}$ and $Q_q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times q}$. The matrix P can be written as

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 \\ P_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

$P_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times r}$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times r}$. The following results have been proved.

Theorem 2.1. (See [1-28]) We consider the systems (1) with a regular pencil. Then, its solution exists and for $k \geq 0$, is given by the formula

$$Y_k = Q_p J_p^k C. \tag{6}$$

Where $C \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a constant vector. The matrices Q_p, Q_q, P_1, P_2, J_p, H_q are defined by (3), (4), (5).

A generalised boundary value problem (BVP) of type (1)–(2) can have a unique solution, infinite solutions or no solutions, see [8], [15].

Definition 2.2. If for the system (1) with boundary conditions (2) there exists at least

one solution, the BVP (1)–(2) is said to be consistent.

Let

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 Q_p \\ A_2 Q_p (N+1)^{\overline{n-1}} F_{n,n} (J_p (N+n)^{\bar{n}})(I_p - J_p) \end{bmatrix} \tag{7}$$

and

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

Then

Theorem 2.2. (See [8], [15]) We consider the BVP (1)–(2) with a regular pencil. Then the BVP is consistent, if and only if one of the following is satisfied:

- $p = r_1 + r_2$ and rank$K = p$;
- $p < r_1 + r_2$, rank$K = p$ and $L \in colspanK$;
- $p > r_1 + r_2$, rank$K = r_1 + r_2$;
- $L \in colspanK$ and K is rank deficient.

3 Non-consistent boundary value problem

We can now state the following Theorem, which provides optimal solutions for non-consistent BVPs of type (1)–(2).

Theorem 3.1. We consider the system (1) with known boundary conditions of type (2) with a regular pencil. Then for the non-consistent BVP of type (1)–(2)

(a) If $p < r_1 + r_2$, $L \notin colspanK$ and K is full rank, an optimal solution of the BVP is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k (K^* K)^{-1} K^* L. \tag{9}$$

(b) If $L \notin colspanK$ and K is rank deficient, an optimal solution of the BVP is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k (K^* K + E^* E)^{-1} K^* L. \tag{10}$$

Where E is a matrix such that $K^*K + E^*E$ is invertible and $\|E\|_2 = \theta$, $0 < \theta << 1$.

The matrices K, L are given by (7)–(8) and the matrices Q_p, J_p are given by (3),(4).

Proof. From Theorem 2.1 it is known that the solution of the system (1) exists and is given by (6). For given boundary conditions of type (2), C is the solution of the linear systems

$$A_1 Q_p C = B_1$$

and

$$A_2 Q_p (N+1)^{\overline{n-1}} F_{n,n} (J_p (N+n)^{\bar{n}})(I_p - J_p) C = B_2,$$

or, equivalently,

$$KC = L. \tag{11}$$

System (11) has $r_1 + r_2$ linear equations and p unknowns.

For the the proof of (a), since $p < r_1 + r_2$, $L \notin colspanK$ and K is full rank, the system (11) has no solutions. Let $\hat{L}$ be a vector such that a vector $\hat{C}$ is the unique solution of the system $K\hat{C} = \hat{L}$. We want then to solve the following optimisation problem

$$\begin{aligned} &min \left\| L - \hat{L} \right\|_2^2 \\ &s.t. \quad K\hat{C} = \hat{L}, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$min \left\| L - K\hat{C} \right\|_2^2.$$

Where $\hat{C}$ is the optimal solution, in terms of least squares, of the linear system (11). In this case, with similar steps as [38], [54], [55], the solution $\hat{C}$ is given by

$$\hat{C} = (K^*K)^{-1}K^*L.$$

This is the least squares solution and hence an optimal solution of the system (1) with boundary conditions of type (2) is given by (9).

For the proof of (b), since $L \notin colspanK$ and K is rank deficient, the system (11) has no solutions. While the matrix K is rank deficient, the matrix K^*K is singular and hence not invertible. Thus we can not apply the same method as in (a). In this case, we seek a solution $\hat{C}$ minimizing the functional

$$D_2(\hat{C}) = \left\| L - K\hat{C} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| E\hat{C} \right\|_2^2.$$

Where E is a matrix such that $K^*K + E^*E$ is invertible and $\|E\|_2 = \theta$, $0 < \theta << 1$. Expanding $D_2(\hat{C})$ gives

$$D_2(\hat{C}) = (L - K\hat{C})^*(L - K\hat{C}) + (E\hat{C})^*E\hat{C},$$

or, equivalently,

$$D_2(\hat{C}) = L^*L - 2L^*K\hat{C} + (\hat{C})^*K^*K\hat{C} + (\hat{C})^*E^*E\hat{C},$$

because $L^*K\hat{C} = (\hat{C})^*K^*L$. Furthermore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{C}} D_2(\hat{C}) = -2K^*L + 2K^*K\hat{C} + 2E^*E\hat{C}.$$

Setting the derivative to zero, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{C}} D_2(\hat{C}) = 0$, we get

$$(K^*K + E^*E)\hat{C} = K^*L.$$

The solution is then given by

$$\hat{C} = (K^*K + E^*E)^{-1}K^*L.$$

Hence an optimal solution in this case is given by (10). The proof is completed.

Remark 3.1. In Theorem 3.1 the optimal solution of the BVP problem (1)–(2) was achieved after a perturbation to the column L accordingly

$$min \left\| L - \hat{L} \right\|_2,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\left\| L - K(K^*K)^{-1}K^*L \right\|_2,$$

in case of (a) and

$$\left\| L - K(K^*K + E^*E)^{-1}K^*L \right\|_2,$$

in case of (b).

A consistent BVP doesn't guaranty unique solution. The case of existence and uniqueness of solutions has been fully analysed in [8], [15].

Proposition 3.1. (See [8], [15]) When the BVP (1)–(2) is consistent, it has a unique solution if and only if one of the following is satisfied

- $p = r_1 + r_2$ and rank$K = p$;
- $p < r_1 + r_2$, rank$K = p$ and $L \in colspanK$.

For a consistent BVPs of type (1)–(2) with infinite solutions, there are different ways to obtain optimal solutions, depending on the problem that the BVP represents. In the following Proposition, we apply some techniques in order to gain the minimum solution.

Proposition 3.2. We consider the system (1) with known boundary conditions of type (2) and a regular pencil. Then in both cases, for a consistent BVP of type (1)–(2) with infinite solutions:

(a) If $K^\dagger$ is the Moore-Penrose Pseudoinverse of K, then an optimal solution of the BVP (1)–(2) is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k K^\dagger L. \tag{12}$$

(b) If $p > r_1 + r_2$, K is full rank, a minimum solution of the BVP is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k (KK^*)^{-1} KL. \tag{13}$$

(c) If $L \in colspanK$ and K is rank deficient, an optimal solution of the BVP is given by (10).

The matrices K, L are given by (7), (8) and the matrices Q_p, J_p are given by (3),(4).

Proof. From Theorem 2.1 it is known that the solution of the system (1) exists and is given by (6). For given boundary conditions of type (2), C is the solution of the linear system (11) which has $r_1 + r_2$ linear equations and p unknowns.

For the proof of (a), given an $(r_1 + r_2) \times p$ matrix K, the Moore-Penrose Pseudoinverse of $K^\dagger$ is calculated from the singular value decomposition of K, see [19, 26]. The solution of system (11) is then given by $\hat{C} = K^\dagger L$.

For the proof of (b), $p > r_1 + r_2$, K is a wide matrix (more columns than rows) and full rank, i.e. the system (11) is underdetermined. In this case, it is common to seek a solution $\hat{C}$ (one of the infinite solutions of system (11)) with minimum norm. Hence we would like to solve the optimisation problem

$$\begin{aligned} &min \quad \left\|\hat{C}\right\|_2^2, \\ &s.t. \quad L = K\hat{C}. \end{aligned}$$

By defining the Lagrangian

$$D_3(\hat{C}, \lambda) = \left\|\hat{C}\right\|_2^2 + \lambda^*(L - K\hat{C}).$$

and taking the derivatives of the Lagrangian we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{C}} D_3(\hat{C}, \lambda) = 2\hat{C} - K^*\lambda$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} D_3(\hat{C}, \lambda) = L - K\hat{C}.$$

Setting the derivatives to zero, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{C}} D_3(\hat{C}, \lambda) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} D_3(\hat{C}, \lambda) = 0$, we get

$$\hat{C} = \frac{1}{2} K^*\lambda$$

and

$$L = K\hat{C},$$

or, equivalently,

$$L = \frac{1}{2} KK^*\lambda.$$

Since $rank K = r_1 + r_2$, the matrix KK^* is invertible and thus

$$\lambda = 2(KK^*)^{-1}L.$$

The solution is then given by

$$\hat{C} = K^*(KK^*)^{-1}L.$$

Hence an optimal solution in this case is given by (a).

For the proof of (c), since $L \in colspanK$ and K is rank deficient, the system (11) has infinite solutions. While matrix K is rank deficient, the matrix KK^* is singular and hence not invertible. In this case, we seek a solution $\hat{C}$ minimizing the functional

$$D_4(\hat{C}) = \left\| L - K\hat{C} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| E\hat{C} \right\|_2^2$$

and by working as in Theorem 3.1 (b), the solution is given by

$$\hat{C} = (K^*K + E^*E)^{-1}K^*L$$

and hence an optimal solution in this case is given by (10). The proof is completed.

Numerical examples

Example 4.1.

Assume the system (1) for k=0, 1, 2, 3. Let

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{3}{4} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\det(sF - G)$=$(s - \frac{1}{2})s(s - \frac{1}{4})$ and the pencil is regular. We assume the boundary conditions (2) with

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 36 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$B_2 = 24$$

or, equivalently,

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 36 \\ 0 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The three finite eigenvalues (p=3) of the pencil are $\frac{1}{2}$, 0, $\frac{1}{4}$ and the Jordan matrix J_p has the form

$$J_p = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By calculating the eigenvectors of the finite eigenvalues we get the matrix Q_p

$$Q_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

After computations

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{24}{36} \end{bmatrix}$$

Furthermore $r_1 + r_2 = 5 > 3 = p$, $rankK = 2 < 3 = p$ and $L \notin colspanK$, i.e. the BVP is non-consistent. Thus from Theorem 3.1 and (b), an optimal solution of the BVP is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k (K^*K + E^*E)^{-1} K^* L,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\hat{Y}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2^k} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4^k} \end{bmatrix} (K^*K + E^*E)^{-1} K^* L.$$

Let

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\theta = 0.00001$. Then an optimal solution for the system is

$$\hat{Y}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{11}{14 \cdot 4^k} \\ \frac{11}{14 \cdot 4^k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 4.2.

We assume the system (1) as in example 4.1 but with different boundary conditions. Let

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 36 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$B_2 = 24.$$

Or, equivalently,

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 36 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}.$$

With easy computations as in example 4.1, we get

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 36 & 36 & 0 \\ 0 & 36 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 36 \\ 0 & 0 & 36 \\ 358 & 35 & 24 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We observe that $L \notin colspanK$, $r_1 + r_2 = 5 > 3 = p$, and $rankK = 3 = p$, i.e. the BVP is non-consistent. Thus from Theorem 4.1 and (a), an optimal solution of the BVP (3)-(4) is given by

$$\hat{Y}_k = Q_p J_p^k (K^* K)^{-1} K^* L.$$

or, equivalently,

$$\hat{Y}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2^k} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4^k} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0.0349 \\ -0.0166 \\ 0.5006 \end{bmatrix},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\hat{Y}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0349 \cdot \frac{1}{2^k} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.5006 \cdot \frac{1}{4^k} \\ 0.5006 \cdot \frac{1}{4^k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Conclusions

In this article we provided optimal solutions for a linear generalized discrete time system with boundary conditions whose coefficients are square constant matrices, its pencil is regular and the leading coefficient singular.

References

[1] T. M. Apostol; *Explicit formulas for solutions of the second order matrix differential equation* $Y'' = AY$, Amer. Math. Monthly 82 (1975), pp. 159-162.

[2] Apostolopoulos, N., Ortega, F. and Kalogeropoulos, G., 2015. *Causality of singular linear discrete time systems*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.04740.

[3] R. Ben Taher and M. Rachidi; *Linear matrix differential equations of higher-order and applications*, E. J. of Differential Eq., Vol. 2008 (2008), No. 95, pp. 1-12.

[4] S. L. Campbell, C.D. Meyer and N.J. Rose ; *Applications of the Drazin inverse to linear systems of differential equations with singular constant coefficients*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 31(3) 411-425, (1976).

[5] S. L. Campbell; *Comments on 2-D descriptor systems*, Automatica (Journal of IFAC), v.27 n.1, p.189-192. (1991).

[6] S. L. Campbell; *Singular systems of differential equations*, Pitman, San Francisco, Vol. 1, 1980; Vol. 2, 1982.

[7] L. Dai, *Impulsive modes and causality in singular systems*, International Journal of Control, Vol 50, number 4 (1989).

[8] I. Dassios, *On a boundary value problem of a class of generalized linear discrete time systems,* Advances in Difference Equations, Springer, 2011:51 (2011).

[9] I.K. Dassios, *On non-homogeneous linear generalized linear discrete time systems*, Circuits systems and signal processing, Volume 31, Number 5, 1699-1712 (2012).

[10] I. Dassios, *On solutions and algebraic duality of generalized linear discrete time systems*, Discrete Mathematics and Applications, Volume 22, No. 5-6, 665–682 (2012).

[11] I. Dassios, *On stability and state feedback stabilization of singular linear matrix difference equations,* Advances in difference equations, 2012:75 (2012).

[12] I. Dassios, *On robust stability of autonomous singular linear matrix difference equations,* Applied Mathematics and Computation, Volume 218, Issue 12, 6912–6920 (2012).

[13] I.K. Dassios, G. Kalogeropoulos, *On a non-homogeneous singular linear discrete time system with a singular matrix pencil* , Circuits systems and signal processing, Volume 32, Issue 4, 1615–1635 (2013).

[14] I. Dassios, G. Kalogeropoulos, *On the relation between consistent and non consistent initial conditions of singular discrete time systems,* Dynamics of continuous, discrete and impulsive systems Series A: Mathematical Analysis, Volume 20, Number 4a, pp. 447–458 (2013).

[15] Dassios I., *On a Boundary Value Problem of a Singular Discrete Time System with a Singular Pencil*, Dynamics of continuous. Discrete and Impulsive Systems Series A: Mathematical Analysis, 22(3): 211-231 (2015).

[16] I. K. Dassios, K. Szajowski, *Bayesian optimal control for a non-autonomous stochastic discrete time system,* Applied Mathematics and Computation , Volume 274, 556–564 (2016).

[17] E. Grispos, S. Giotopoulos, G. Kalogeropoulos; *On generalised linear discrete-time regular delay systems.*, J. Inst. Math. Comput. Sci., Math. Ser. 13, No.2, 179-187, (2000).

[18] E. Grispos, *Singular generalised autonomous linear differential systems.*, Bull. Greek Math. Soc. 34, 25-43 (1992).

[19] Kaczorek, T.; *General response formula for two-dimensional linear systems with variable coefficients.* IEEE Trans. Aurom. Control Ac-31, 278-283, (1986).

[20] Kaczorek, T.; *Equivalence of singular 2-D linear models.* Bull. Polish Academy Sci., Electr. Electrotechnics, 37, (1989).

[21] Kalogeropoulos, Grigoris, and Charalambos Kontzalis. *Solutions of Higher Order Homogeneous Linear Matrix Differential Equations: Singular Case.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.05667 (2015).

[22] J. Klamka, J. Wyrwa, *Controllability of second-order infinite-dimensional systems.* Syst. Control Lett. 57, No. 5, 386–391 (2008).

[23] J. Klamka, *Controllability of dynamical systems*, Matematyka Stosowana, 50, no.9, pp.57-75, (2008).

[24] C. Kontzalis, G. Kalogeropoulos. *Controllability and reachability of singular linear discrete time systems.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1489 (2014).

[25] F. L. Lewis; *A survey of linear singular systems*, Circuits Syst. Signal Process. 5, 3-36, (1986).

[26] F.L. Lewis; *Recent work in singular systems*, Proc. Int. Symp. Singular systems, pp. 20-24, Atlanta, GA, (1987).

[27] F. L. Lewis; *A review of 2D implicit systems, Automatica (Journal of IFAC)*, v.28 n.2, p.345-354, (1992).

[28] L. Verde-Star; *Operator identities and the solution of linear matrix difference and differential equations*, Studies in Applied Mathematics 91 (1994), pp. 153-177.

[29] I. Dassios, A. Zimbidis, *The classical Samuelson's model in a multi-country context under a delayed framework with interaction,* Dynamics of continuous, discrete and impulsive systems Series B: Applications & Algorithms, Volume 21, Number 4-5b pp. 261–274 (2014).

[30] I. Dassios, A. Zimbidis, C. Kontzalis. *The Delay Effect in a Stochastic Multiplier-Accelerator Model.* Journal of Economic Structures 2014, 3:7.

[31] I. Dassios, G. Kalogeropoulos, *On the stability of equilibrium for a reformulated foreign trade model of three countries.* Journal of Industrial Engineering International, Springer, Volume 10, Issue 3, pp. 1-9 (2014). 10:71 DOI 10.1007/s40092-014-0071-9.

[32] I. Dassios, M. Devine. *A macroeconomic mathematical model for the national income of a union of countries with interaction and tradel.* Journal of Economic Structures 2016, 5:18.

[33] Ogata, K: Discrete Time Control Systems. Prentice Hall, (1987)

[34] W.J. Rugh; *Linear system theory*, Prentice Hall International (Uk), London (1996).

[35] J.T. Sandefur; *Discrete Dynamical Systems*, Academic Press, (1990).

[36] A. P. Schinnar, *The Leontief dynamic generalized inverse.* The Quarterly Journal of Economics 92.4 pp. 641-652 (1978).

[37] D. Baleanu, K. Diethelm, E. Scalas, *Fractional Calculus: Models and Numerical Methods,* World Scientific (2012).

[38] I.K. Dassios, *Optimal solutions for non-consistent singular linear systems of fractional nabla difference equations*, Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing, Springer, Volume 34, Issue 6, pp. 1769-1797 (2015). DOI 10.1007/s00034-014-9930-2

[39] I.K. Dassios, D. Baleanu, *On a singular system of fractional nabla difference equations with boundary conditions,* Boundary Value Problems, 2013:148 (2013).

[40] I.K. Dassios, D.I. Baleanu. *Duality of singular linear systems of fractional nabla difference equations.* Applied Mathematical Modeling, Elsevier, Volume 39, Issue 14, pp. 4180-4195 (2015). DOI 10.1016/j.apm.2014.12.039

[41] I. Dassios, D. Baleanu, G. Kalogeropoulos, *On non-homogeneous singular systems of fractional nabla difference equations,* Applied Mathematics and Computation, Volume 227, 112–131 (2014).

[42] I. Dassios, *Geometric relation between two different types of initial conditions of singular systems of fractional nabla difference equations*, *Math. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1002/mma.3771.

[43] I. Dassios, *Stability and robustness of singular systems of fractional nabla difference equations*. Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing (2016). doi:10.1007/s00034-016-0291-x

[44] T. Kaczorek, *Application of the Drazin inverse to the analysis of descriptor fractional discrete-time linear systems with regular pencils.* Int. J. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci 23.1, 2013: 29–33 (2014).

[45] I. Podlubny, *Fractional Differential Equations, Mathematics in Science and Engineering*,p. xxiv+340. Academic Press, San Diego, Calif, USA (1999).

[46] H.-W. Cheng and S. S.-T. Yau; *More explicit formulas for the matrix exponential*, Linear Algebra Appl. 262 (1997), pp. 131-163.

[47] B.N. Datta; *Numerical Linear Algebra and Applications*, Cole Publishing Company, 1995.

[48] L. Dai, *Singular Control Systems*, Lecture Notes in Control and information Sciences Edited by M.Thoma and A.Wyner (1988).

[49] R. F. Gantmacher; *The theory of matrices I, II*, Chelsea, New York, (1959).

[50] G. I. Kalogeropoulos; *Matrix pencils and linear systems*, Ph.D Thesis, City University, London, (1985).

[51] Kontzalis, Charalambos P., and Panayiotis Vlamos. *Solutions of Generalized Linear Matrix Differential Equations which Satisfy Boundary Conditions at Two Points.* Applied Mathematical Sciences 9.10 (2015): 493-505.

[52] I. E. Leonard; *The matrix exponential*, SIAM Review Vol. 38, No. 3 (1996), pp. 507-512.

[53] G.W. Steward and J.G. Sun; *Matrix Perturbation Theory*, Oxford University Press, (1990).

[54] Apostolopoulos, N., Ortega, F. and Kalogeropoulos, G., 2015. *The case of a generalised linear discrete time system with infinite many solutions.* arXiv:1610.00927.

[55] I. Dassios, A. Jivkov, A. Abu-Muharib and P. James. A mathematical model for plasticity and damage: A discrete calculus formulation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 2015. DOI 10.1016/j.cam.2015.08.017.